

Decision 03-01-075 January 30, 2003

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Order Instituting Rulemaking on the  
Commission's Own Motion to Determine  
Whether Baseline Allowances for Residential  
Usage of Gas and Electricity Should Be Revised.

Rulemaking 01-05-047  
(Filed May 24, 2001)

**OPINION ON REQUEST FOR INTERVENOR COMPENSATION**

This decision grants Disability Rights Advocates (DRA) \$48,179.40 for its contribution to Decision (D.) 02-04-026.

**Background**

In Phase 1 of this proceeding, we addressed four main issues, of which the medical baseline program was DRA's focus. DRA proposed changes to that program, including translating medical baseline forms into additional languages and Braille, simplification and standardization of the forms, and improving their availability, improved outreach for the program, and relaxation of some recertification requirements. (D.02-04-026, pp. 20-27.) We largely adopted DRA's proposals.

**Requirements for Awards of Compensation**

An intervenor who seeks compensation for its contribution in a Commission proceeding must file a request for compensation pursuant to Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812. The intervenor must be a "customer" as defined in § 1802(b). Pub. Util. Code § 1804(a) requires the intervenor to file a notice of intent (NOI) to claim compensation within 30 days of the prehearing conference (PHC) or by a date established by the Commission. The NOI must present

information regarding the nature and extent of planned participation and an estimated budget; the NOI also may request a finding of eligibility based on significant financial hardship, or it may defer that showing until the intervenor actually requests compensation following the decision.

Other code sections address requests for compensation filed after a Commission decision is issued. Section 1804(c) requires an intervenor requesting compensation to provide “a detailed description of services and expenditures and a description of the customer’s substantial contribution to the hearing or proceeding.” Section 1802(h) states that “substantial contribution” means that,

“in the judgment of the commission, the customer’s presentation has substantially assisted the commission in the making of its order or decision because the order or decision has adopted in whole or in part one or more factual contentions, legal contentions, or specific policy or procedural recommendations presented by the customer. Where the customer’s participation has resulted in a substantial contribution, even if the decision adopts that customer’s contention or recommendations only in part, the commission may award the customer compensation for all reasonable advocate’s fees, reasonable expert fees, and other reasonable costs incurred by the customer in preparing or presenting that contention or recommendation.”

Section 1804(e) requires the Commission to issue a decision that determines whether or not the customer has made a substantial contribution and the amount of compensation to be paid. The level of compensation must take into account the market rate paid to people with comparable training and experience who offer similar services, consistent with § 1806.

### **NOI to Claim Compensation**

DRA filed a timely NOI to claim compensation on July 20, 2002, as required by § 1804(a). In an Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) ruling on

March 7, 2002, DRA was found to be a “customer” as defined by § 1802(b), in that DRA is a representative of a group or organization that is authorized by its bylaws or articles of incorporation to represent the interests of residential ratepayers. However, the ALJ ruled that DRA had not made the necessary showing to establish significant financial hardship. The ruling indicated that DRA should make that showing in its request for compensation.

### **Timeliness of Request**

Section 1804(c) requires an eligible customer to file a request for an award within 60 days of issuance of a final order or decision by the Commission in the proceeding. D.02-04-026 was effective on April 9, 2002 and was mailed to parties of record the next day. DRA’s request for compensation was filed on June 10, 2002 and thus is timely. On August 2, 2002, DRA filed a supplement to its request for compensation.

### **Significant Financial Hardship**

Only those customers for whom participation would impose a significant financial hardship may receive compensation. Section 1802(g) defines “significant financial hardship as either”:

“that the customer cannot without undue hardship afford to pay the costs of effective participation, including advocate’s fees, expert witness fees, and other reasonable costs of participation, or that, in the case of a group or organization, the economic interest of the individual members of the group or organization is small in comparison to the costs of effective participation in the proceeding.

DRA’s request for compensation includes its showing of financial hardship. DRA states that:

“Although the medical baseline allowance issue is of critical importance to individuals with disabilities, the cost of participating in the proceedings would have been prohibitive

for individual energy consumers and in excess of the benefit each individual might receive from participation in the proceedings. Individuals with disabilities experience a much higher rate of poverty than those without disabilities and therefore participating in the Commission's proceeding would have been extremely burdensome if not impossible for these individuals."

DRA's members are residential customers whose individual interests in this proceeding are small relative to the costs of participation and the cost of DRA's participation in Commission proceedings substantially outweighs the benefit to any individual customer it represents. DRA meets the requirements of § 1802(g).

### **Contributions to Resolution of Issues**

In order to be compensated for participation in a Commission proceeding, a party must demonstrate that it substantially assisted in the making of a Commission order or decision. As we stated in the past, this requirement is necessary to ensure "that the compensated participation provides value to ratepayers."<sup>1</sup> A party may make a substantial contribution to a decision in various ways. It may offer a factual or legal contention upon which the Commission relied in making a decision. It may advance a specific policy or procedural recommendation that the ALJ or the Commission adopted. A substantial contribution includes evidence or argument that supports part of the decision even if the Commission does not adopt a party's position in total.

In this proceeding there is no question that DRA made a substantial contribution. DRA focused its participation on the medical baseline program, and was the only party making significant proposals for changes to that

program. While the Commission did not adopt every detail of every proposal made by DRA, when viewed from a larger perspective, DRA was very successful in persuading the Commission to adopt its recommendations.

In D.98-04-059, the Commission adopted a requirement that a customer demonstrate that its participation was “productive,” as that term is used in § 1801.3, where the Legislature provided guidance on program administration. (See D.98-04-059, *mimeo.*, at 31-33, and Finding of Fact 42.) D.98-04-059 explained that participation must be productive in the sense that the costs of participation should bear a reasonable relationship to the benefits realized through such participation. D.98-04-059 directed customers to demonstrate productivity by assigning a reasonable dollar value to the benefits of their participation to ratepayers. This exercise assists us in determining the reasonableness of the request and in avoiding unproductive participation.

Although it is difficult to quantify how the program changes DRA contributed to will affect utility costs and customer costs, DRA has attempted to quantify the impact. DRA indicates that the current number of medical baseline participants exceeds 100,000. DRA suggests that it makes sense to assume that each current customer will save at least \$1.00 per year as a result of the changes it recommended. In addition, many of DRA’s recommendations should result in utility cost savings from reduced staff time, more online forms, and streamlined forms and re-certification. As a result, DRA believes that there should be additional savings that will accrue as a result of its contributions, likely in the

---

<sup>1</sup> See D.98-04-059, at 39.

range of an additional \$100,000. On that basis, DRA argues that it contributed to savings of at least \$100,000, a benefit in excess of its requested compensation.

DRA's work did not duplicate that of any other party, nor does DRA appear to have put in any disproportionate amount of time or detail.<sup>2</sup> In addition, DRA's attorney Parks was very effective and professional in the hearing room, particularly given her level of experience.

All of these factors lead us to conclude that the participation of DRA was productive, avoided unreasonable duplication with other parties, and yielded ratepayer benefits in excess of the costs incurred.

---

<sup>2</sup> In fact, some of DRA's recommendations would have been more helpful if they had been more detailed.

### The Reasonableness of Requested Compensation

DRA requests \$55,845.15<sup>3</sup> as described in the table below.

| Advocate               | Year      | Rate     | Hours | Total              |
|------------------------|-----------|----------|-------|--------------------|
| Shawna Parks           | 2001-2002 | \$235.00 | 58.5  | \$13,747.50        |
| Sid Wollinsky          | 2001-2002 | \$535.00 | 28.3  | \$15,140.50        |
| Laurence Paradis       | 2001      | \$405.00 | 8.4   | \$3,402.00         |
| Caroline Jacobs        | 2002      | \$210.00 | 2.6   | \$546.00           |
|                        |           |          |       | \$32,836.00        |
| Legal Assistants       | 2001-2002 | \$105.00 | 85.8  | \$9,009.00         |
| Senior Legal Assistant | 2001-2002 | \$155.00 | 4.3   | \$666.50           |
| Summer Associates      | comp      | \$52.50  | 24.3  | \$1,275.75         |
|                        |           |          |       | \$10,951.25        |
| Gayatri Schilberg      | 2001-2002 | \$130.00 | 66.73 | \$8,674.90         |
| Other Costs            |           |          |       | \$3,383.00         |
| <b>Total</b>           |           |          |       | <b>\$55,845.15</b> |

### Hours Claimed

In general, the number of hours claimed by DRA appears to be reasonable. One unusual aspect of DRA's request, however, is that it includes hours for work performed before the issuance of the Order Instituting Rulemaking (OIR) that initiated this proceeding and for work performed after the Commission issued D.02-04-026. In response to an ALJ Ruling of July 19, 2002, DRA has provided additional explanation of the basis for its request to be compensated for work it performed prior to the formal opening of the proceeding. DRA has shown to our satisfaction that there is a clear and direct relationship between the work it did prior to the issuance of the OIR and its participation in the proceeding itself. Specifically, DRA's preparation work

---

<sup>3</sup> In DRA's June 10, 2002 request, this figure was calculated at \$55,844.65 but was corrected in the August 2, 2002 supplement.

was performed relatively close to the date of the issuance of the OIR, and involved investigation of medical baseline issues (including community outreach), and investigation and communications relating to how to address medical baseline issues at the Commission. DRA's work prior to the OIR was focused upon the same issues that ultimately became its proposals in the proceeding. With the relatively fast schedule for the proceeding and DRA's lack of experience in Commission proceedings, DRA's early preparation likely allowed it to present its proposals in a more effective and developed manner than would otherwise have been possible. Given these facts, and the moderate number of hours (14.4) claimed prior to issuance of the OIR, we find that it is reasonable to compensate DRA for the work it performed prior to the issuance of the OIR.

As noted in the ALJ ruling of July 19, 2002, D.02-04-026 specifically requested DRA to perform certain tasks to implement the decision. Accordingly, even though hours worked after the issuance of the relevant decision would typically be considered outside the scope of the proceeding, and would require significant justification in order to be found compensable, here the Commission itself was directly responsible for DRA working these hours, and it is reasonable to compensate DRA for its work.

DRA incurred a small amount of time for travel (0.4 hours by Jacobs) to attend a meeting at the Commission. This amount of time is reasonable. DRA incurred 4.1 hours by legal assistants and 24.3 hours by summer associates related to filing its NOI and compensation request. This amount of time is reasonable.



### **Hourly Rates**

Section 1806 requires the Commission to take into consideration the “market rate paid to persons of comparable training and experience who offer similar services” when establishing hourly rates. In its supplemental filing, DRA provided additional support for the hourly rates that it seeks, and clarified the rates that it seeks for certain of its attorneys. Specifically, DRA seeks hourly rates of \$535 for Sid Wolinsky, \$405 for Lawrence Paradis, \$235 for Shawna Parks, and \$210 for Caroline Jacobs.

These rates are quite high when examined in the context of recent Commission decisions adopting rates for work in 2001 and 2002. In particular, the rates DRA seeks for Wolinsky and Paradis are higher than rates the Commission has awarded to any attorney. Furthermore, while DRA was generally successful in obtaining its desired outcome in this proceeding, it did not present any particularly novel or controversial claims, nor did it face any significant opposition. DRA’s proposals consisted of suggestions for improving an existing Commission program, and to the extent there was any opposition to DRA’s proposals, such opposition was quite restrained. While we appreciate the realistic, pragmatic, and reasonable approach taken by DRA, the consequence of that approach was that the issues addressed by DRA did not involve any particularly difficult questions.

We also note that DRA has requested hourly rates for all of its attorneys at what it describes as “regular hourly rates for the year 2002.” (Request, pp. 14-15.) The Commission’s practice has been to award compensation based on the rate in the year the work was performed, rather than the year in which the request is made. This proceeding was litigated, briefed, and submitted in 2001, with the majority of the work performed in 2001. 2002 rates are not appropriate

for work done in 2001. Given that the vast majority of substantive work in this proceeding occurred in 2001, and because much of the work in 2002 arose from the fact that the rather general proposals of the parties (including DRA) required more development, it is appropriate to award compensation for all work on medical baseline issues at 2001 rates.

Based on the information submitted by DRA, the 2001 rates for its attorneys are: \$525 per hour for Wolinsky, \$375 per hour for Paradis, \$200 for Parks, and \$185 for Jacobs. We will use these rates as our starting point in evaluating DRA's request for each of its attorneys.

Parks acted as the lead attorney in presenting DRA's case to the Commission. Her name appeared on the pleadings, she performed all cross-examination of witnesses, and she had by far the largest number of hours claimed by DRA attorneys. In 2001, Parks had approximately two years of experience. According to DRA, her hourly rate for 2001 was \$200. This requested rate is closer to rates we have typically awarded to attorneys with about four years of experience. (*See* D.02-05-005.) Given Parks' significant role in this proceeding, the professionalism and efficiency she displayed in the hearing room, and the success of DRA in obtaining its desired results, a rate of \$190 per hour is reasonable for Parks.

Jacobs had a minor role in the proceeding, and only performed 2.6 hours of work for which compensation was claimed. Of the claimed hours, 0.4 hours are for travel, according to her timesheets. Jacobs graduated from law school in 2000. We recently awarded an attorney with approximately one year of experience a 2001 rate of \$165 in D.02-05-005. Jacobs has somewhat more experience so a rate of \$175 per hour is reasonable for Jacobs. We will award her travel time at half this hourly rate.

Wolinsky undisputedly has extensive litigation experience, and DRA has provided voluminous documentation in support of its requested hourly rate of \$525 per hour for 2001. For example, DRA has shown that Wolinsky was awarded attorney's fees in federal court at the rate of \$525 for 2001.

Nevertheless, the requested rate is significantly higher than any rate the Commission has ever awarded, even to highly experienced attorneys who regularly practice before the Commission, and it is not clear that Wolinsky's work in this proceeding justifies the requested rate. We have similar concerns about the hourly rate DRA is requesting for Paradis. Paradis' work was performed exclusively in 2001 but DRA has requested compensation for Paradis at \$405 per hour, Paradis' claimed 2002 rate. DRA identifies his 2001 rate as \$375 per hour. Similar to Wolinsky, Paradis has been awarded attorneys' fees at this rate by a federal court.

The highest hourly rate this Commission has awarded for 2001 is \$350 for Michel Florio of The Utility Reform Network (TURN). (*See* D.02-06-070.) Florio has been awarded \$385/hour for work in 2002 in D.02-11-069. Florio was admitted to the California bar in 1978, and has worked almost exclusively in the field of public utility regulatory law. Florio is a highly skilled, experienced, and effective advocate, with substantial expertise in the complex substance and process of litigation before the Commission. While Wolinsky and Paradis do have significant litigation experience, as well as significant experience in the specialty of disability rights, neither has the experience of Florio in the area of utility regulation.

Paradis has less overall experience than Florio, having graduated from law school in 1985, yet DRA requests a higher hourly rate for Paradis than approved for Florio. Paradis' experience makes him more closely equivalent to

Robert Finkelstein of TURN, who also graduated from law school in 1985, for whom the Commission has awarded compensation for 2001 at the rate of \$310 per hour. (D.02-03-033.) Given Paradis' limited role in this proceeding, and the nature of the proceeding itself, we see no reason for Paradis to be compensated at a higher rate than Finkelstein. Accordingly, we award compensation to DRA for the work of Paradis at the rate of \$310 per hour.

Wolinsky has more years of practice than Florio, which tends to support a higher rate than Florio. Awarding an hourly rate to Wolinsky in proportion to the rate we award to Paradis, results in a rate of \$435 per hour.<sup>4</sup> In reviewing DRA's supplemental filing, the Declaration of Richard Pearl (Attachment B) shows that for attorneys with more than 30 years of experience, 2001 rates range from \$375 to \$1000 per hour.<sup>5</sup> Based upon the examples cited by Pearl, hourly rates at this senior level do not correspond precisely to years of experience.<sup>6</sup> A rate of \$435 per hour is well within this range, and is appropriate in light of all of the factors discussed above, and accordingly we will award DRA compensation for Wolinsky's 2001 and 2002 hours at that rate.

DRA has requested a rate of \$130 per hour for its expert witness, Gayatri Schilberg for work between June 2001 and September 2001. The

---

<sup>4</sup> This is calculated by taking the relationship between the stated 2001 rate for Paradis (\$375) and the rate that we find reasonable (\$310), and applying the same multiplier (approximately .83) to Wolinsky's stated 2001 rate of \$525.

<sup>5</sup> Pearl's declaration cites to specific examples of both surveys and court-awarded attorneys' fees.

<sup>6</sup> For example, the rate awarded to an attorney with 36 years experience was higher than the rates of two attorneys with 39 years of experience, and the rate of an attorney with 33 years of experience was higher than that awarded to an attorney with 34 years of experience.

Commission previously awarded compensation for Schilberg at the rate of \$115 for work performed from March 2000 through February 2001 in D.02-06-070. DRA did not provide justification for the requested increase in its request but states that \$130 per hour was the actual rate paid to Schilberg. We note that other intervenors have submitted requests for the same rate (\$130/hour) for work performed by Schilberg after March 2001. (*See, for example, A.93-12-025, et al.*) We agree that a rate of \$130 per hour for Schilberg's work in 2001 is reasonable.

DRA has requested an hourly rate of \$105 for legal assistants (paralegals) and summer associates, and \$155 for senior legal assistants (paralegals). Despite the express request of the July 19, 2002 ALJ Ruling, DRA has not described the experience of the paralegals or summer associates for whom it is requesting compensation in this proceeding. This absence of support for the requested rates makes DRA's request difficult to evaluate, especially since the rates requested are significantly above those we have historically awarded to paralegals. In D.00-04-011 and D.01-09-045, we awarded compensation to paralegals and law clerks at the rate of \$75 per hour.

The only description provided of the experience of the senior paralegal, Jason Galek, is that he "has nearly six years of paralegal experience with DRA." If DRA considers a paralegal with less than six years experience to be "senior," we must assume that its junior paralegals must be very junior indeed. The passage of time from the above-cited decisions does justify some increase from the rates we have previously awarded, but DRA's failure to provide any description of the experience or qualifications of its junior legal assistants, summer associates, and law clerks does not support its request for an hourly rate

of \$105. We will accordingly award compensation to DRA for its legal assistants and summer associates at the rate of \$85 per hour.

Similarly, DRA has not provided an adequate basis for its requested rate for its senior paralegal, Galek. According to DRA's own information, the \$155 hourly rate it is requesting for Galek is at (or even above) the top range for paralegals. While Galek may be a fine paralegal, DRA has provided virtually no information to support its claim for such a high rate. There are many paralegals with experience significantly in excess of that of Galek, and we do not find it appropriate to compensate someone with less than six years experience at the very top of the range for all paralegals. Given Galek's experience, previous Commission decisions awarding compensation for paralegals, and the range of rates cited by DRA, a rate of \$110 per hour is reasonable for Galek.

According to their time sheets, 4.1 hours of time spent by legal assistants and all of the time spent by summer associates was related to preparing DRA's NOI or compensation request. Our normal practice is to compensate at half the full hourly rate time spent on preparation of the intervenor compensation request. (D.98-04-059, 79 CPUC2d 628, 688.) Here, DRA utilized legal assistants and summer associates to prepare its compensation request. When a less highly compensated advocate has prepared the request for compensation, we have awarded compensation at the full hourly rate and we do so here. (*See* D.98-12-953 at 13.)

### **Other Costs**

DRA claims \$3,383.00 for costs relating to photocopying, postage, delivery, phone, fax, travel, and word processing. Consistent with D.99-08-005 we do not reimburse intervenors for administrative costs like word processing

because professional fees assume overheads and are set accordingly. We award compensation for the remainder of the requested costs, totaling \$3,223.50.

**Award**

We award DRA \$48,179.40 for its contribution to D.02-04-026 as detailed below:

| <b>Advocate</b>        | <b>Year</b> | <b>Rate</b> | <b>Hours</b> | <b>Total</b>       |
|------------------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|--------------------|
| Shawna Parks           | 2001-2002   | \$190.00    | 58.5         | \$11,115.00        |
| Sid Wolinsky           | 2001-2002   | \$435.00    | 28.3         | \$12,310.50        |
| Laurence Paradis       | 2001        | \$310.00    | 8.4          | \$2,604.00         |
| Caroline Jacobs        | 2002        | \$175.00    | 2.2          | \$385.00           |
| Caroline Jacobs        | Travel      | \$87.50     | 0.4          | \$35.00            |
|                        |             |             |              | \$26,449.50        |
| Legal Assistants       | 2001-2002   | \$85.00     | 81.7         | \$6,944.50         |
| Legal Assistants       | Comp        | \$85.00     | 4.1          | \$348.50           |
| Senior Legal Assistant | 2001-2002   | \$110.00    | 4.3          | \$473.00           |
| Summer Associate       | Comp        | \$85.00     | 24.3         | \$2,065.50         |
|                        |             |             |              | \$9,831.50         |
| Gayatri Schilberg      | 2001-2002   | \$130.00    | 66.73        | \$8,674.90         |
| Other Costs            |             |             |              | \$3,223.50         |
| <b>Total:</b>          |             |             |              | <b>\$48,179.40</b> |

All gas and electric utilities under our jurisdiction were named respondents to this rulemaking. Mountain Utilities, a small electric utility serving approximately 125 customers, filed a response to DRA's request for compensation seeking to be exempted from paying a proportional share of any award made to DRA. Mountain Utilities argues that its proportional share is so small that the administrative burden associated with payment of its share of the award would outweigh the cost of payment. We agree and will not require Mountain Utilities to contribute towards payment of the award. We will assess responsibility for payment in accordance with the respective 2001 California jurisdictional gas and electric revenues of Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), Southern California Edison Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, Southern California Gas Company, Southwest Gas Company,



Sierra Pacific Power Company, PacifiCorp, and Bear Valley Electric Company. PG&E has agreed to coordinate the allocation of the award to ensure that each utility's share is allocated correctly.

Consistent with previous Commission decisions, we will order that interest be paid on the award amount (calculated at the three-month commercial paper rate), commencing the 75th day after DRA filed its compensation request and continuing until each utility makes full payment of its share of the award.

### **Waiver of Comment Period**

Pursuant to Rule 77.7 (f)(6), the otherwise applicable 30-day period for public review and comment is being waived.

### **Assignment of Proceeding**

Geoffrey Brown was the Assigned Commissioner and Peter Allen was the assigned Administrative Law Judge in this proceeding.

### **Findings of Fact**

1. DRA made a timely request for compensation for its contributions to D.02-04-026.
2. DRA contributed substantially to D.02-04-026.
3. The participation of DRA was productive in that the costs claimed for its participation were less than the benefits realized.
4. The adopted hourly rates for DRA's advocates are based on market rates paid to persons of comparable training and experience who offer similar services and the rates for other advocates appearing before the Commission.
5. The hours claimed for work performed in this case are itemized and reasonable.
6. The miscellaneous costs incurred by DRA are reasonable except as described.

7. The Appendix to this decision summarizes today's award.

**Conclusions of Law**

1. DRA has fulfilled the requirements of §§ 1801-1812, which govern awards of intervenor compensation.

2. DRA should be awarded \$48,179.40 for contributions to D.02-04-026.

3. Per Rule 77.7(f)(6) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, the comment period for this compensation decision may be waived.

4. This order should be effective today so that DRA may be compensated without unnecessary delay.

**O R D E R**

**IT IS ORDERED** that:

1. Disability Rights Advocates (DRA) is awarded \$48,179.40 in compensation for its substantial contribution to Decision 02-04-026.

2. Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), Southern California Edison Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, Southern California Gas Company, Southwest Gas Company, Sierra Pacific Power Company, Pacificorp, and Bear Valley Electric Company shall pay DRA the award granted by Ordering Paragraph 1 in accordance with their share of 2001 California jurisdictional gas and electric revenues. PG&E has agreed to coordinate the allocation of the award to ensure that each utility's share is allocated correctly. Payment shall be made within 30 days of the effective date of this order, including interest on the award at the rate earned on prime, three-month commercial paper, as reported in Federal Reserve Statistical Release H.15, beginning the 75<sup>th</sup> day after June 10, 2002, the date the request was filed.

3. The comment period for today's decision is waived.
4. This order is effective today.

Dated January 30, 2003, at San Francisco, California.

MICHAEL R. PEEVEY  
President  
CARL W. WOOD  
LORETTA M. LYNCH  
GEOFFREY F. BROWN  
SUSAN P. KENNEDY  
Commissioners

### Compensation Decision Summary Information

|                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| <b>Compensation Decision(s):</b> | D0301075   |
| <b>Contribution Decision(s):</b> | D0204026   |
| <b>Proceeding(s):</b>            | R0105047   |
| <b>Author:</b>                   | ALJ Allen  |
| <b>Payer(s):</b>                 | Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, Southern California Gas Company, Southwest Gas Company, Sierra Pacific Power Company, PacifiCorp, Bear Valley Electric Company |

### Intervenor Information

| <b>Intervenor</b>           | <b>Claim Date</b> | <b>Amount Requested</b> | <b>Amount Awarded</b> | <b>Reason Change/Disallowance</b> |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Disability Rights Advocates | 6/10/02           | \$55,845.15             | \$48,179.40           | Failure to justify hourly rates   |

### Advocate Information

| <b>First Name</b> | <b>Last Name</b> | <b>Type</b> | <b>Intervenor</b>           | <b>Hourly Fee Requested</b> | <b>Year Hourly Fee Requested</b> | <b>Hourly Fee Adopted</b> |
|-------------------|------------------|-------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Shawna            | Parks            | Attorney    | Disability Rights Advocates | \$235                       | 2001                             | \$190                     |
| Shawna            | Parks            | Attorney    | Disability Rights Advocates | \$235                       | 2002                             | \$190                     |
| Sid               | Wolinsky         | Attorney    | Disability Rights Advocates | \$535                       | 2001                             | \$435                     |
| Sid               | Wolinsky         | Attorney    | Disability Rights Advocates | \$535                       | 2002                             | \$435                     |
| Lawrence          | Paradis          | Attorney    | Disability Rights Advocates | \$405                       | 2001                             | \$310                     |
| Caroline          | Jacobs           | Attorney    | Disability Rights Advocates | \$210                       | 2002                             | \$175                     |
| Jason             | Galek            | Paralegal   | Disability Rights Advocates | \$155                       | 2001                             | \$110                     |
|                   | Legal Assistant  | Paralegal   | Disability Rights Advocates | \$105                       | 2001                             | \$85                      |
| Gayatri           | Schilberg        | Economist   | Disability Rights Advocates | \$130                       | 2001                             | \$130                     |